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Abstract
Protection of traditional settlements as part of Greek cultural heritage was enabled in 1978 with the enactment of “Traditional Settlements Protection Act”. Since then traditional settlements of Greece number almost one thousand. They are mostly small-scale villages (less than 500 inhabitants), although there are few cases in which they constitute parts of larger cities. As for their geographical and spatial features, traditional settlements are characterized by a balanced geographical distribution both in insular and continental Greece, while the majority of them is located either in the coastal or in the mountainous parts of the country.

Based on these findings, the paper attempts to form a spatial typology for traditional settlements of Greece. Combining a set of geographical and spatial features the paper ends up to the formation of 12 different types. A graduated “protection degree” as a composite of several protection rules and restrictions is proposed to be applied, accommodating in that way the special features and characteristics of each distinct category.
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1. INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND DEFINITIONS

Greece is globally known for its rich cultural and monumental heritage dating back to Ancient times. In fact, its unique archeological sites - which number few thousands - are some of the most famous tourist and cultural destinations all over the world. Though, a less known part of Greek monumental and built heritage is that of traditional settlements.

Traditional Settlements are mostly small villages with special architectural characteristics, distinct urban form and unique social and historical features, which vary according to local geographical conditions and building traditions. The notion of traditional settlements as part of Greek cultural heritage was imported for the first time in the national legislative system with the 1975s Constitution enactment1. Despite the fact that they are constitutionally protected there is not a solid definition of what constitutes a traditional settlement in any national legislative document. Actually it was not until Granada’s Convention, that adopted by Greek State in 1992 (Law 2039/1992), that a definition for traditional settlements was established2. According to the Convention, traditional settlements are “a homogeneous set of urban or rural constructions that have special architectural, structural, social or historical features which are unique, valuable and need to be protected” [2].

---

1 Hellenic Constitution (art.24, §1) distinguishes natural from cultural environment, the protection of which is a State affair and every civilian’s right. The State is obliged to provide adequate protection for all elements of the natural and cultural environment. Cultural environment includes any manmade formation that refers to cultural heritage, which can be monumental, traditional or architectural. Under this notion, the constitution (art.24, §6) sets for the first time the agenda for special state protection and designation of “monuments, traditional areas and any traditional elements”.

2 Until then, there was only a reference in the Greek General Building Code for the protection of traditional settlements (Legislative Act 8/1973, art. 79 and Law 1577/19885, art. 4). According to this reference “as traditional settlement can be designated any autonomous settlement or part of a larger city or town, with the purpose to conserve and designate their special historical, urban, architectural, cultural, social and aesthetical nature” [1].
Later, in 2002 with the most recent Archeological Law (Law 3028/2002) traditional settlements were included in the greater notion of cultural heritage as places of “collective human action” or as “historical sites” that their protection is mandated by “their folklore, ethnological, social, architectural, industrial, historical and scientific significance” [3].

Despite the fact that traditional settlements constitute an important part of Greek built heritage the current protection legislative framework seems to be ineffective due to complete absence of spatial criteria in the protection guidelines. To this purpose, the scope of this paper is to propose spatial and legislative directions for an appropriate and effective protection policy of traditional settlements in Greece. Therefore, the paper starts with the presentation of the relative legislation for the protection of these settlements, in order to reveal the weaknesses and gaps that led to today’s inefficient protection policy. It continuous with the presentation of spatial and geographical features of traditional settlements (distribution, size etc), that ends up to the formation of a typology according to these characteristics. Finally, identifying the legislative weaknesses in conjunction with the different types of traditional settlements, the paper concludes with spatially oriented protection guidelines that correspond to traditional settlements’ distinct geographical and spatial features.

2. LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL SETTLEMENTS

A historical review of the Greek legislation for the protection of traditional settlements goes back to 1975 where the notion of cultural heritage protection was a constitutional requirement. The recent constitutional amendments (2001 and 2008) empowered and enriched the protection of cultural heritage as part of the greater sense of sustainability. Therefore, the State is obliged to adopt a sustainable planning policy (Hellenic Constitution, Art.24) that will ensure perpetualness preservation of any cultural and natural possessions, such as to be preserved for future generations.
In this context, cultural heritage protection should be part of the greater spatial planning policy that in Greek legislative realm is expressed by the “Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development Planning Law” (L.2742/1999). This law foresees three types of plans: the nationwide General Framework for Planning and Sustainable Development, the Regional Frameworks for Sustainable Planning and Development and the Sectoral Plans at national level. These plans should comply with the three basic pillars of “protection-development-cohesion” that express the constitutionally mandated notion of sustainability. In this context, protection of traditional settlements becomes part of a wider national spatial planning policy that has to do with the systematic protection, restoration, preservation and designation of areas, settlements and landscapes that have significant natural, cultural and architectural heritage elements.

The first effort for the protection of traditional settlements was made even before this was constitutionally mandated. The Legislative Decree of 1973 referred as General Building Code (GBC) provided a primitive yet sufficient legal framework for the definition of traditional settlements either as part of larger cities or as autonomous settlements. The criteria that this Decree established had to do with the distinct “historical, cultural, aesthetical, architectural and urban features” of a building or an inhabited (or not) settlement. GBC was later supplemented by several construction and morphological rules that applied specifically to buildings and not to settlements as integrated entities. Subsequent GBC amendments (Law 1577/85, L2831/2000 and L4067/2012) did not import any significant changes in regard to the criteria of the characterization or to the management (designation and definition) of traditional settlements [1].

Despite the fact that the legislative framework for the designation and protection of traditional settlements was set in place from 1973, it was not until 1978 that the first legislative act in the form of Presidential Decree (PD) was enacted. With the Traditional Settlements Protection Act (TSPA) - or else the PD of 1978 for the Protection of Traditional Settlements - a total of 421 settlements were designated as traditional [4]. The Act referred to the national territory and included settlements from both the mainland and insular parts of Greece. The main purpose of the act was to establish a set of general building regulations and morphological rules that would apply to all designated settlements until more detailed and specialized architectural and urban studies were conducted for each one of them.

The 1978s P.D. is considered to be a milestone in the protection of traditional settlements, and it has become the guideline for a lot of subsequent legislative acts. Actually, from 1978 till today an additional of 503 settlements were designated as traditional. In most of these cases the Council of State required that building regulations and morphological rules, set by the relative legislative acts, complies with those set by the 1978s Traditional Settlements Protection Act (CoS Decision D200/2008).

Despite the general and temporary character of TSPA it had significant impact in the formation of protection guidelines for hundreds of traditional settlements. At the same time TSPA seems to have some serious drawbacks that probably acted against its initial purpose. Following, there is a short presentation of the features and characteristics that should have been taken into consideration over the designation process but most importantly should have been reflected in the formation of the building protection guidelines that were institutionalized with TSPA.

First of all, there was no diversification of the proposed building regulations according to the geographical features of the settlements. As mentioned above, the Act referred to the national territory and included settlements from both mainland and insular regions. It is obvious that settlements in these two regions have substantial differences in regard to their architectural features and urban fabric, due to the morphology of the terrain and the altitude of the settlement itself. For
instance, mountainous mainland settlements are identified by totally different building features relatively to the mountainous insular settlements or the insular coastal settlements relatively to mainland coastal settlements.

As a result the 421 settlements that were designated as traditional by this specific Act, had significant variation in terms of their architectural and morphological features. These features had to do with the materials used for construction, that most of the times were locally based, but also with the building techniques used. Building techniques were completely adapted to local climate conditions and materials, and they would have been in compliance with any bioclimatic construction principles of today. A representative example of locally based architectural and morphological characteristics would be a typical residence in Cyclades in comparison to a typical residence in the mountainous area of Pelion in central continental Greece. In the first case the houses were built in such ways to eliminate exposure to the sun and wind. In contrast, residences in mountainous areas had specially designed “sun rooms” for more sun exposure over winter season.

The developmental profile of a settlement is another significant feature that should have been taken into account in order to identify its future prospects that would in turn be reflected into the relative protection requirements. There are several growth indices that could be used for this purpose but most of the times population size and rate of change can adequately indicate a settlement’s developmental course. Furthermore, 1978’s Act did not classify settlements in relation to the developmental prospects of its greater area i.e. part of a large city, satellite to a large urban center, isolated in a mountainous area or located within a tourist rapid growing coastal area. Therefore, different developmental profiles should be accommodated by appropriate building rules.

It is obvious that any future endeavor to establish protection guidelines for traditional settlements should take into consideration the above mentioned features (geographical, spatial, developmental, and environmental). It the context of this paper, there was an effort to incorporate, for a start, the geographical and spatial features of the settlements. To this purpose, the next section is a presentation of spatial and geographical features of traditional settlements.

3. THE GEOGRAPHY OF TRADITIONAL SETTLEMENTS

3.1 Research Methodology
The first step for the realization of this research was to establish an updated database for the traditional settlements of Greece. Therefore, an extended archive research was conducted in the relevant authorities: Ministry of Environment, Energy and Climate Change, Ministry of Macedonia & Thrace and the General Secretariat of Aegean Sea and Insular Policy. The scope of the archive research was to create a directory of traditional settlements as of today (December 2012). Finally, this directory was enriched with data (population, altitude, location, administrative district etc) obtained from the Hellenic Statistical Authority (EL.STAT.)

All tables and maps presented in this paper are derived from the data processing of the above mentioned database. EGSA 87 projection system was used in the case of maps. Finally, it should be noted that during the process of recording, the following assumptions were made:
- The historical center of Athens, the refugee settlement of New Philadelphia and the center of the suburban area of Kifissia, which are parts of Athens conurbation, were recorded as one (1) and not as three (3) separate settlements in the database.

---

3 It should be noted that a substantial part of the above mentioned database was composed in the Department of Spatial Planning and Analysis, Faculty of Engineering, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, with the contribution of the undergraduate student Aliki Metalinou.
Although the designated -by the 1978’s Act- settlements of Diporo, Kafki, and Vata (Prefecture of Lakonia) were not found in the Ministries’ archives nor in the 2011 census data, they were included in the database, with the assumption that are abandoned or uninhabited.

There were few cases (approximately 20) that settlements designated by the 1978’s Act were not registered in census data. In order to locate these settlements cadastral satellite images were used. Since most of them were concentrations of just few buildings, it was assumed that they belong to the population classes of 0-10 and 11-50 inhabitants, according to the number of buildings recorded though the satellite image.

3.2 Geographical data and distribution
According to the most recent data (YPEKA archives, 2012), traditional settlements of Greece number 924 [5]. Amongst them, 421 were characterized directly with the TSPA (Traditional Settlements Protection Act) of 1978, while the rest (i.e. 503) were designated later on.

From the beginning (1978), traditional settlements were characterized by a balanced geographical distribution, since they were located in all 13 Regions of Greece (41 out of 51 Prefectures of the country). Since then - and even if the number of traditional settlements was doubled up to today’s number (from 421 to 924) - the geographical dispersion did not differentiate, because the majority of the new designations followed the 1978s traditional settlements distribution (Map 2).

Based on the statistical data (Table 1), the Regions which concentrate the majority of traditional settlements are: Southern Aegean, Northern Aegean, Crete, Ionian Islands, Peloponnese and Epirus.

---

4 The selection of the first 421 traditional settlements was based on a study conducted in 1977 by the Hellenic Ministry of Interior Affairs. The study, titled “Recognition and identification of “outstanding” settlements in Greece”, recorded a total of 2,238 settlements with “outstanding” and significant architectural features [6]. That means that only a quarter (1/4) of the recorded settlements of this study was included in the Protection Act of 1978.
Amongst them, the highest concentrations (clusters) are found in Cyclades, Dodecanese, the Ionian islands, the wider area of Rethymnon in Crete, as well as in the mountainous parts of Laconia and Arcadia (in Peloponnese), Zagorochoria (in Epirus) and in Mount Pelion in central Greece (Map 1). Therefore, it becomes clear that the majority of traditional settlements in Greece is located either in the insular or in the mountainous parts of the country.

**Table 1. Geographical distribution of traditional settlements in Greece**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Continental traditional settlements</th>
<th>Insular traditional settlements</th>
<th>Total of traditional settlements</th>
<th>Percentage (%) in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Macedonia and Thrace</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Macedonia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Macedonia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epirus</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionian Islands</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thessaly</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental (Sterea) Greece</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Greece</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peloponnese</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>18.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Aegean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Aegean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>407</strong></td>
<td><strong>517</strong></td>
<td><strong>924</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: data processed by authors

**Table 2. Distribution of traditional settlements per altitude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iso-contour Zone</th>
<th>Continental traditional settlements</th>
<th>Insular traditional settlements</th>
<th>Total of traditional settlements</th>
<th>Percentage (%) in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 100 m.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 200 m.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 – 300 m.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 – 400 m.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 – 500 m.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 600 m.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 – 700 m.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 – 800 m.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 – 900 m.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901 – 1000 m.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 1100 m.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101 – 1200 m.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 – 1300 m.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301 – 1400 m.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>407</strong></td>
<td><strong>517</strong></td>
<td><strong>924</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EL.STAT, data processed by authors

As shown in Table 2, 56% of traditional settlements are located in Greek islands. At the same time, more than a quarter (248 out of 924) is located in the coastal zone (altitude 0-100m) both in insular and in continental Greece. Furthermore, almost 1/3 of them (about 32%) is found in the mountainous areas (above iso-contour of 600m) of continental Greece (Map 3), while another 10% of insular traditional settlements are also located above iso-contour of 400m (Table 2). In conclusion, it is indicative that the highest traditional settlements of insular Greece are: Omalos (1,048m) in Crete, Pezion (778m.) and Lagkada (766m.) in Ikaria island. On the other hand, the highest traditional settlements of continental Greece are: Nymfeo (1,353m) in Florina, Vradeto (1,344m.) in Zagorochoria, Magouliana (1,224m.) in Arcadia and St. Athanasios (1,200m.) in Pella.
Map 3. Distribution of traditional settlements per iso-contour zone (source: processed by authors)

Map 4. Population class of traditional settlements (source: processed by authors)
3.3 Population and size

Population wise, traditional settlements in Greece are mostly small scale inhabited villages. As shown in Table 3, almost 95% of them have population less than 2,000 inhabitants [7]. More specifically, in half of them (47%) the population is under 100 inhabitants (Table 4), while in 1/3 of the 924 traditional settlements, the population is no higher than 50 inhabitants. It is also essential to notice that in some cases (approximately 20), there were found abandoned settlements, with no registered population in the census archives (mainly in the areas of Laconia, Mount Pelion and in Aegean Islands).

As for traditional settlements that belong to the upper population classes (10,000+ inh.), they concern middle-sized or larger cities, in which the Act of designation refers to as “parts/units of the cities” and not the whole entity of city (e.g. old town/historical center of Athens, Upper Town of Thessaloniki, historical center of Patras etc). In total, these cases (i.e. traditional settlements as parts of cities), number about 20 in Greece.

**Table 3. Distribution of traditional settlements per population size (2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population class</th>
<th>Continental traditional settlements</th>
<th>Insular traditional settlements</th>
<th>Total of traditional settlements</th>
<th>Percentage (%) in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 500,000 inh.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 500,000 inh.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 100,000 inh.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 50,000 inh.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 10,000 inh.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2,000 inh.</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>94,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>407</strong></td>
<td><strong>517</strong></td>
<td><strong>924</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011 (EL.STAT), Data processed by authors

**Table 4. Distribution of traditional settlements with population less than 2,000 inh. (2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population class</th>
<th>Continental traditional settlements</th>
<th>Insular traditional settlements</th>
<th>Total of trad. settlements with population less than 2,000</th>
<th>Percentage (%) in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1501 – 2,000 inh.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 – 1,500 inh.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 – 1,000 inh.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 700 inh.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 – 500 inh.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 – 400 inh.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 – 300 inh.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 200 inh.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100 inh.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>15,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 50 inh.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10 inh.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>493</strong></td>
<td><strong>871</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011 (EL.STAT), Data processed by authors

4. TOWARDS A SPATIAL TYPOLOGY FOR GREEK TRADITIONAL SETTLEMENTS

In an effort to configure a spatial typology for traditional settlements, it is of substantial importance to use criteria based on geographical, geo-morphological and spatial features. Therefore, having these three main criteria in mind, the following categories of traditional settlements are formed:

---

5 According to the Hellenic Statistical Authority of Greece, a settlement with population above 2,000 is defined as town and lower than 2,000 is defined as village.

---
Criteria 1: Based on the geomorphology of the terrain (geographical criteria):
- **Category 1a**: coastal traditional settlements
- **Category 1b**: semi-mountainous traditional settlements
- **Category 1c**: mountainous traditional settlements

Criteria 2: Based on the geo-spatial morphology (geo-spatial criteria):
- **Category 2a**: insular traditional settlements
- **Category 2b**: continental traditional settlements

Criteria 3: Based on the spatial form at national level (spatial criteria):
- **Category 3a**: traditional settlements in clusters
- **Category 3b**: single traditional settlements
- **Category 3c**: traditional settlements as parts of middle-sized cities or urban agglomerations

Table 5 depicts the 12 different types of traditional settlements that were created through the combination of the eight categories mentioned above. It should be noted that categories 1b and 1c (semi-mountainous and mountainous traditional settlements) were eventually consolidated. This was considered to be necessary because semi-mountainous settlements represent only 10% of traditional settlements of Greece; therefore there were no substantial reasons for their differentiation (form the mountainous ones) in protection guidelines proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Typology codification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insular Traditional Settlements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainous/ Semi-mountainous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having set the typology in place, the next step was to apply a graduated “protection degree”, according to the special features and needs of each type (see Table 5). In the case of Greek traditional settlements it was estimated that a three level gradation is an appropriate scale:

- **Protection Degree 1**: Absolute Protection
- **Protection Degree 2**: Significant Protection
- **Protection Degree 3**: Limited Protection

Finally, according to the protection degree established for each type of traditional settlements there were certain planning restrictions and rules proposed. These rules aim at regulating issues such as (according to planning scale):
- **Architectural scale:**
  - morphology of buildings
- **Urban/spatial scale:**
  - spatial/urban morphology of the settlement’s tissue (expansions or land development issues)
  - morphology of public spaces
  - land-use conflicts
  - transportation and mobility issues

It is obvious that, the higher the protection degree is, the stricter the planning restrictions and rules are. Reversely, the lower the protection degree is, the milder the planning restrictions should be. For example, “Absolute Protection” of a settlement would mean complete and integrated protection of the settlement with high respect to the morphological and aesthetical features of the buildings. New
constructions should follow strict regulations such as to preserve the special features of the settlement. Preservation of urban tissue is also a high priority. Strict rules should also apply to the type of materials used for any kind of construction (buildings, roads etc). There should be zero tolerance in any settlement expansion. Car use should be restricted. Finally, certain land uses should be permitted in order to eliminate any aesthetical, noise and olfactory nuisance. Under the same notion, Protection Degree 2 and 3 (“Significant Protection” and “Limited Protection” respectively) have less restrictive rules or else more flexibility to all rules applied.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Traditional settlements constitute an important part of Greek cultural heritage of modern times, protected for the first time in 1978. Since then, designated traditional settlements reached almost one thousand. Although, a closer look to their protection policies reveal several inefficiencies due to an obsolete legislative framework.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to formulate general directions for an appropriate and effective protection measures for traditional settlements. The 12 different types of traditional settlements created and their respective protection degree, is only an initial effort towards this direction. In any case these general directions could be a rough guideline not only for the already characterized settlements but also for the approximate one thousand (1,000) settlements that are recorded as “outstanding”, but they are not under any protection policy. Lastly, it should be noted that the typology of traditional settlements presented in this paper, incorporated geographical and spatial features. It is obvious that in order to create an integrated legislative framework this typology should be enriched by developmental characteristics such as demographic, economic and environmental that will be incorporated in the next phase of this research endeavor.
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